APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/504,236	02/15/2000	Swain W. Porter	0034646.P008	7611

25943   7590   05/30/2003

SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.
PACWEST CENTER, SUITES 1600-1900
1211 SW FIFTH AVENUE
PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER
BAUGH, APRIL L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2143	9

DATE MAILED: 05/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-55* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-55* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on *12 May 2003* is: a)☒ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

   If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
   application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

   a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Claims 1-55 are pending.

Drawings

1.   The proposed drawing correction and/or the proposed substitute sheets of drawings, filed

on March 12, 2003 have been accepted. A proper drawing correction or corrected drawings are

required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The correction to

the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-55 have been considered but are moot in

view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United
> States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who
> has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention
> thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

2.   Claim 1, 3-6, 9, 12-14, 20-32, 39-49 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable by US Patent No. 6,496,855 to Hunt et al.

Referring to claim 1, Hunt et al. teaches a method comprising: a computer, on behalf of a user, registering the user with a first web site; the computer providing a first email address for use to register the user with said first web site; the computer, on behalf of the user, registering the user with a second website; and the computer providing a second email address, separate and distinct from the first email address, for use to register said user with said second web site (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt et al.).

Regarding claim 3, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the first email address comprises an address of an email service provider, and the second email address comprises the address of the same email service provider (column 5, lines 2-4 and column 7, lines 12-19 of Hunt et al.).

Regarding claim 5, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein each of said providing of the first and second email addresses by the computer comprises selecting said first/second email address from a plurality of distinct email addresses pre-provided to said computer (column 4, lines 11-16 of Hunt et al.).

Referring to claim 6, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 5, wherein the method further

comprises the computer pre-obtaining the distinct email addresses from an email service provider

(column 4, lines 11-18 and column 5, lines 2-4 of Hunt et al.).

Regarding claim 9, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein each of said

providing of the first and second email addresses by the computer comprises the computer

dynamically obtaining said first/second email address from an email service provider (column 4,

lines 11-18 and column 5, lines 2-4 of Hunt et al.).

Referring to claim 12, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the method

further comprises notifying an email service provider of the usage of the first and second email

address, including addresses of the first and the second web site (column 5, lines 2-4 and column

7, lines 12-19 of Hunt et al.).

Regarding claim 13, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 12, wherein each of said

notification is performed integrally as said first/second email address is provided to said user for

use to register the user with the first/second web site (column 5, lines 2-4 and column 7, lines 12-

19 of Hunt et al.).

Referring to claim 14, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 12, wherein said

notifications are performed subsequently in batch after said first and second email addresses

were provided to said user for use to register the user with the first and the second web site

(column 5, lines 2-4 and column 7, lines 12-19 of Hunt et al.).

Regarding claim 20, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the web site is a

selected one of a content provider, a service provider and an access provider (column 1, lines 58-

61 and column 5, lines 2-4 of Hunt et al.).

Referring to claim 21, Hunt et al. teaches a method comprising: an electronic device (e-device) obtaining a plurality of distinct email addresses from an email service provider (column 5, lines 2-4 of Hunt et al.); the e-device selecting a first of said distinct email addresses to facilitate communication with a first communication partner or group of communication partners (CP/GCP); and the e-device selecting a second of said distinct email addresses to facilitate communication with a second CP/GCP (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt et al.).

Regarding claim 22, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 21, wherein the method further comprises the e-device notifying the email service provider of said selection of the first of said distinct email addresses to facilitate communication with the first CP/GCP; and the e-device notifying the email service provider of said selection of the second of said distinct email addresses to facilitate communication with the second CP/GCP (column 7, lines 12-19 of Hunt et al.).

Referring to claim 23, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 21, wherein the method further comprises the e-device notifying the email service provider of said selections of the first and the second of said distinct email addresses to facilitate communication with the first and the second CP/GCP (column 7, lines 12-19 of Hunt et al.).

Regarding claim 24. Hunt et al. teaches a method comprising: an electronic device (e-device) obtaining a first email address from an email service provider (column 5, lines 2-4 of Hunt et al.); the e-device employing the first email address to facilitate communication with a first communication partner or group of communication partners (CP/GCP) (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt et al.); the e-device obtaining a second email address, separate and distinct from said first email address, from the email service provider; and the e-device employing the second

email address to facilitate communication with a second CP/GCP (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt et al.).

Referring to claim 25, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 24, wherein the method further comprises the e-device notifying the email service provider of said employment of the first email address to facilitate communication with the first CP/GCP; and the e-device notifying the email service provider of said employment of the second email address to facilitate communication with the second CP/GCP (column 7, lines 12-19 of Hunt et al.).

Regarding to claim 26, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 25, wherein each of said notifications is made integrally when the e-device requests said first/second email address from said email service provider (column 7, lines 12-19 of Hunt et al.).

Referring to claim 27, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 25, wherein each of said notifications is made after the e-device having been provided with said first/second email address from said email service provider (column 7, lines 12-19 of Hunt et al.).

Regarding claim 28, Hunt et al. teaches a method comprising: a email service provider registering a user; and the email service provider providing at least a first and a second email address, that are separate and distinct, to the user for use by the user to communicate with a first and a second communication partner or group of communication partners (CP/GCP) (column 4, lines 11-20 and column 5, lines 2-4 of Hunt et al.).

Referring to claim 29, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 28, wherein the method comprises the email service provider providing a plurality of distinct email addresses to an electronic device (e-device) used by the user for the e-device to select said first and second separate and distinct email addresses (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt et al.).

Referring to claim 30, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 28, wherein the method comprises the email service provider providing in real time said first/second email address to an electronic device used by the user (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt et al.).

Regarding claim 31, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 28, wherein the method further comprises the email service provider receiving notification of usage of said first/second email address with said first/second CP/GCP from an electronic device used by the user (column 7, lines 12-19 of Hunt et al.).

Referring to claim 32, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 28, wherein the method further comprises the email service provider receiving notification of usage of said first and second email addresses with said first and second CP/GCP respectively from an electronic device used by the user (column 7, lines 12-19 of Hunt et al.).

Regarding claim 39, Hunt et al. teaches an apparatus comprising: a storage medium having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions (column 11, lines 57-60 of Hunt et al.) designed to enable the apparatus (when the programming instructions are executed) to obtain a plurality, of distinct email addresses from an email service provider, to selecting a first of said distinct email addresses to facilitate communication with a first communication partner or group of communication partners (CP/GCP), and to select a second of said distinct email addresses to facilitate communication with a second CP/GCP; and a processor coupled to the storage medium to execute the plurality of programming instructions (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt et al.).

Referring to claim 40, Hunt et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 39, wherein the programming instructions (column 11, lines 57-60 of Hunt et al.) further enable the apparatus (when the programming instructions are executed) to notify the email service provider of said

selection of the first and the second of said distinct email addresses to facilitate communication

with the first and the second CP/GCP (column 1, lines 46-48 of Hunt et al.).

Regarding claim 41, Hunt et al. teaches an apparatus comprising: a storage medium

having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions (column 11, lines 57-60 of Hunt et

al.) designed to enable the apparatus (when the programming instructions are executed) to obtain

a first and a second distinct email address from an email service provider in real time, and

correspondingly earmarking said first and second distinct email addresses to facilitate

communication with a first and a second communication partner or group of communication

partners (CP/GCP); and a processor coupled to the storage medium to execute the plurality of

programming instructions (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt et al.).

Referring to claim 42, Hunt et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 41, wherein the

programming instructions (when executed) further enable the apparatus to notify of said

employment of the first and second email addresses to facilitate communication with the first and

second CP/GCP (column 7, lines 12-19 of Hunt et al.).

Regarding claim 43, Hunt et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 42, wherein the

programming instructions (when executed) enable the apparatus to make each of said

notifications integrally when requesting for said first/second email address from said email

service provider (column 7, lines 12-19 of Hunt et al.).

Referring to claim 44, Hunt et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 42, wherein the

programming instructions (when executed) enable the apparatus to make each of said

notifications after having been provided with said first/second email address from said email

service provider (column 7, lines 12-19 of Hunt et al.).

Regarding claim 45. Hunt et al. teaches an apparatus comprising: a storage medium having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions (column 11, lines 57-60 of Hunt et al.) design to enable the server (when the programming instructions are executed) to register a user, and to provide at least a first and a second email address, that are separate and distinct, to the user for use by the user to communicate with a first and a second communication partner or group of communication partners (CP/GCP); and a processor coupled to the storage medium to execute the programming instructions (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt et al.).

Referring to claim 46, Hunt et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 45, wherein the programming instructions (column 11, lines 57-60 of Hunt et al.) (when executed) enable the apparatus to provide a plurality of distinct email addresses to an electronic device (e-device) used by the user for the e-device to select said first and second separate and distinct email addresses (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt et al.).

Regarding claim 47, Hunt et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 45, wherein the programming instructions (when executed) enable the apparatus to provide in real time said first/second email address to an electronic device used by the user (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt et al.).

Referring to claim 48, Hunt et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 45, wherein the programming instructions (when executed) further enable the apparatus to receive notification of usage of said first/second email address with said first/second CP/GCP from an electronic device used by the user (column 7, lines 12-19 of Hunt et al.).

Regarding claim 49, Hunt et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 45, wherein the programming instructions (when executed) enable the apparatus to receive notification of usage

of said first and second email addresses with said first and second CP/GCP respectively from an

electronic device used by the user (column 7, lines 12-19 of Hunt et al.).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claim 2, 4, 7, 8, 10, and 11 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

US Patent No. 6,266,690 to Hunt et al. in view of Linden et al.

Regarding claim 2, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 1 (column 4, lines 11-20 of

Hunt et al.).

Hunt et al. does not teach of identifiers contained in the email address. Linden et al.

teaches the first email address comprises a first user identifier, and the second email address

comprises a second user identifier, separate and distinct from said first user identifier (column 8,

lines 62-63 of Linden et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill

in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy

system of Hunt et al. by having identifiers contained in the email address because this

distinguishes one user who subscribes to the website from another user that subscribes to the

same website.

Referring to claim 4, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the first email

address comprises an address of an email service provider, and the second email address

comprises the address of the same email service provider (column 5, lines 2-4 and column 7, lines 12-19 of Hunt et al.).

Hunt et al. does not teach of identifiers contained in the email address. Linden et al. teaches the first email address comprises a first user identifier, and the second email address comprises a second user identifier, separate and distinct from said first user identifier (column 8, lines 62-63 of Linden et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. by having identifiers contained in the email address because this distinguishes one user who subscribes to the website from another user that subscribes to the same website.

Referring to claim 7, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 6(column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt et al.).

Hunt et al. does not teach of pre-generation of email addresses. Linden et al. teaches the method further comprises the email service provider pre-generating the distinct email addresses (column 6, lines 46-47 of Linden et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. by pre-generating email addresses because this eliminates the need for the user to create an email address and this also avoids redundancy in email addresses.

Regarding claim 8, Hunt et al. the method of claim 1, wherein each of said providing of the first and second email addresses by the computer (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt et al.).

Hunt et al. does not teach dynamically generating said first/second email address by said computer. Linden et al. teaches dynamically generating said first/second email address by said computer (column 6, lines 46-47 of Linden et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. by dynamically generating said first/second email address by said computer because this eliminates the need for the user to create an email address and this also avoids redundancy in email addresses.

Referring to claim 10, Hunt et al. the method of claim 9, wherein each of said dynamically obtaining comprises the email service provider selecting said first/second email address (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt et al.).

Hunt et al. does not teach pre-generation of distinct email addresses. Linden et al. teaches selecting said first/second email address from a plurality of pre-generated distinct email addresses (column 6, lines 46-47 of Linden et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. by pre-generating distinct email addresses because this eliminates the need for the user to create an email address and this also avoids redundancy in email addresses.

Regarding claim 11, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 9 (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt et al.).

Hunt et al. does not teach the email service provider dynamically generating said first/second email address. Linden et al. teaches the email service provider dynamically generating said first/second email address (column 6, lines 46-47 of Linden et al.). Therefore it

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. by having the email service provider dynamically generating said first/second email address because this eliminates the need for the user to create an email address and this also avoids redundancy in email addresses.

5.   Claim 15-19, 33-38, 50-55 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,266,690 to Hunt et al. in view of Kamiya et al.

Referring to claim 15, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 1 (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt et al.).

Hunt et al. does not teach organizing said received emails based at least in part on whether the emails are addressed to the first or the second email address. Kamiya et al. teaches receiving emails addressed to said first and second email addresses; organizing said received emails based at least in part on whether the emails are addressed to the first or the second email address (column 4, lines 3-10 of Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. by organizing said received emails based at least in part on whether the emails are addressed to the first or the second email address because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from.

Regarding claim 16, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 15 (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt et al.).

Hunt et al. does not teach organizing of said received emails. Kamiya et al. teaches organizing of said received emails is at least further based on whether said received emails

addressed to said first/second email addresses were sent by said first/second web site or not (column 4, lines 3-10 and column 9, lines 38-51 of Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. by organizing of said received emails because this notifies the user of whether the emails are from a website the user subscribed to.

Referring to claim 17, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 16 (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt et ai.).

Hunt et al. does not teach deleting all received emails not sent by said first/second web site. Kamiya et al. teaches deleting all received emails addressed to said first/second email addresses not sent by said first/second web site, while preserving all undeleted emails addressed to said first/second email addresses sent by said first/second web site (column 4, lines 3-10 and column 9, lines 38-51 and column 17, lines 24-30 of Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. by deleting all received emails not sent by said first/second web site because these emails are of no interest to the user since they did not subscribe to those sites therefore this frees up memory in the system.

Regarding claim 18, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 17 (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt et al.).

Hunt et al. does not teach deletion is performed in response to an instruction of said user. Kamiya et al. teaches said bifurcated deletion is performed in response to an instruction of said user (column 17, lines 24-30 of Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one

having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site

registration proxy system of Hunt et al. by having the deletion performed in response to an

instruction of said user because this allows the user to read emails that may not come from

registered websites.

Referring to claim 19, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 18 (column 4, lines 11-20 of

Hunt et al.).

Hunt et al. does not teach providing said deletion instruction with a single press of a

key/control button. Kamiya et al. teaches providing the user with an end user interface feature to

provide said deletion instruction with a single press of a key/control button (column 17, lines 24-

30 and column 23, lines 23-28 of Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one

having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site

registration proxy system of Hunt et al. by providing said deletion instruction with a single press

of a key/control button because this is an efficient way of allowing the user to quickly delete any

unwanted emails.

Regarding claim 33, Hunt et al. teaches of email addresses (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt

et al.).

Hunt et al. does not teach organizing said received emails based at least in part on said first

and second email addresses, and intended versus unintended communication partners of said first

and second email addresses. Kamiya et al. teaches a email service provider receiving emails

addressed to a first and a second email address of a user; and the email service provider

organizing said received emails based at least in part on said first and second email addresses,

and intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses

(column 4, lines 3-10 and column 9, lines 38-51 of Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further

modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. by organizing said received emails

based at least in part on said first and second email addresses, and intended versus unintended

communication partners of said first and second email addresses because this helps the user

discern from which website the emails are from and notifies the user of whether the emails are

from a website the user subscribed to.

Referring to claim 34, Hunt et al. teaches of email addresses (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt

et al.).

Hunt et al. does not teach providing said emails to the user, with the emails characterized by

at least said first and second email addresses, and intended versus unintended communication

partners of said first and second email addresses. Kamiya et al. teaches providing said emails to

the user, with the emails characterized by at least said first and second email addresses, and

intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses

(column 4, lines 3-10 and column 9, lines 38-51 of Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further

modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. by providing said emails to the user,

with the emails characterized by at least said first and second email addresses, and intended

versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses because this

helps the user discern from which website the emails are from and notifies the user of whether

the emails are from a website the user subscribed to.

Regarding claim 35, Hunt et al. teaches of email addresses (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt et al.).

Hunt et al. does not teach emails are characterized based at least in part on by email addresses, and intended versus unintended communication partners of each of said email addresses. Kamiya et al. teaches receiving emails, from an email service provider, wherein the emails are characterized based at least in part on by email addresses, and intended versus unintended communication partners of each of said email addresses; and presenting said emails for viewing by a user, organized by at least said email addresses and said intended versus unintended communication partners of said email addresses (column 4, lines 3-10 and column 9, lines 38-51 of Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. by having the emails characterized based at least in part on by email addresses, and intended versus unintended communication partners of each of said email addresses because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from and notifies the user of whether the emails are from a website the user subscribed to.

Referring to claim 36, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 35 of email addresses (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt et al.).

Hunt et al. does not teach deleting all received emails addressed to the first/second email address not sent by the intended communication partner of the first/second email address. Kamiya et al. teaches deleting all received emails addressed to the first/second email address not sent by the intended communication partner of the first/second email address (column 4, lines 3-10 and column 9, lines 38-51 and column 17, lines 24-30 of Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would

have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. by deleting all received emails addressed to the first/second email address not sent by the intended communication partner of the first/second email address because these emails are of no interest to the user since they did not subscribe to those sites therefore this frees up memory in the system.

Regarding claim 37, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 36 of email addresses (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt et al.).

Hunt et al. does not teach deletion is performed in response to user instruction. Kamiya et al. teaches deletion is performed in response to user instruction (column 17, lines 24-30 of Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. by having deletion performed in response to user instruction because this allows the user to read emails that may not come from registered websites.

Referring to claim 38, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 37 of email addresses (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt et al.).

Hunt et al. does not teach providing the user with an end user interface feature to provide said user instruction with a single press of a key/control button. Kamiya et al. teaches providing the user with an end user interface feature to provide said user instruction with a single press of a key/control button (column 17, lines 24-30 and column 23, lines 23-28 of Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. by providing the user with an end user interface feature to provide said user instruction with a single

press of a key/control button because this is an efficient way of allowing the user to quickly delete any unwanted emails.

Regarding claim 50, Hunt et al. teaches an apparatus comprising: a storage medium having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions (column 11, lines 57-60 of Hunt et al.).

Hunt et al. does not teach organize said received emails based at least in part on said first and second email addresses, and intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses. Kamiya et al. teaches receive emails addressed to a first and a second email address of a user, and to organize said received emails based at least in part on said first and second email addresses, and intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses; and a processor coupled to the storage medium to execute the plurality of programming instructions (column 4, lines 3-10 and column 9, lines 38-51 of Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. by organizing said received emails based at least in part on said first and second email addresses, and intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from and notifies the user of whether the emails are from a website the user subscribed to.

Referring to claim 51, Hunt et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 50, wherein the programming instructions (column 11, lines 57-60 of Hunt et al.) (when executed) further enable the apparatus to

Hunt et al. does not teach provide said emails to the user, with emails characterized by at least said first and second email addresses, and intended versus unintended communication

partners of said first and second email addresses. Kamiya et al. teaches provide said emails to the user, with emails characterized by at least said first and second email addresses, and intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses (column 4, lines 3-10 and column 9, lines 38-51 of Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. by providing said emails to the user, with emails characterized by at least said first and second email addresses, and intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from and notifies the user of whether the emails are from a website the user subscribed to.

Regarding claim 52, Hunt et al. teaches an apparatus comprising: a storage medium having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions (column 11, lines 57-60 of Hunt et al.).

Hunt et al. does not teach emails being characterized based at least in part on by email addresses, and intended versus unintended communication partners of each of said email addresses. Kamiya et al. teaches receiving emails from an email service provider, the emails being characterized based at least in part on by email addresses, and intended versus unintended communication partners of each of said email addresses, and to present said emails for viewing by a user, organized by at least said email addresses and said intended versus unintended communication partners of said email addresses; and a processor coupled to the storage medium to execute the plurality of programming instructions (column 4, lines 3-10 and column 9, lines 38-51 of Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of

Hunt et al. by emails being characterized based at least in part on by email addresses, and

intended versus unintended communication partners of each of said email addresses because this

helps the user discern from which website the emails are from and notifies the user of whether

the emails are from a website the user subscribed to.

Referring to claim 53, Hunt et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 52, wherein the

programming instructions (column 11, lines 57-60 of Hunt et al.).

Hunt et al. does not teach delete all received emails addressed to the first/second email

address not sent by the intended communication partners of the first/second email address.

Kamiya et al. teaches delete all received emails addressed to the first/second email address not

sent by the intended communication partners of the first/second email address (column 4, lines 3-

10 and column 9, lines 38-51 and column 17, lines 24-30 of Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would

have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. by deleting all received

emails addressed to the first/second email address not sent by the intended communication

partners of the first/second email address because these emails are of no interest to the user since

they did not subscribe to those sites therefore this frees up memory in the system.

Regarding claim 54, Hunt et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 53, wherein the

programming instructions (column 11, lines 57-60 of Hunt et al.).

Hunt et al. does not teach perform said deletion in response to user instruction. Kamiya et

al. teaches perform said deletion in response to user instruction (column 17, lines 24-30 of

Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et

al. by performing said deletion in response to user instruction because this allows the user to read

emails that may not come from registered websites.

Referring to claim 55, Hunt et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 54, wherein the

programming instructions (column 11, lines 57-60 of Hunt et al.).

Hunt et al. does not teach provide the user with an end user interface feature to provide said

user instruction with a single press of a key/control button. Kamiya et al. teaches provide the user

with an end user interface feature to provide said user instruction with a single press of a

key/control button (column 17, lines 24-30 and column 23, lines 23-28 of Kamiya et al.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. by

providing the user with an end user interface feature to provide said user instruction with a single

press of a key/control button because this is an efficient way of allowing the user to quickly

delete any unwanted emails.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to April L Baugh whose telephone number is 703-305-5317. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:00am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached on 703-308-5221. The fax phone numbers for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-9149 for regular

communications and 703-746-9149 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

ALB
May 21, 2003

DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100